

76  
issue, that it was something that could not be talked about legally. Well, I am going to explain some of those reasons to you. In order for us to provide internet to anybody we cannot ride on the exact same current. For example, if the current is running (working with flip charts) this is the plant, this is Fort Yukon and in order to provide internet access to this community their services cannot go over this line, it have to be something that is totally separate. Legally you cannot put anything on here when you are dealing with federal dollars, the government does not allow for it. Its called illegal if you do it. But if you do it totally separate it can be done. Currently in our proposal we have a project right now that can provide those services to the villages. That is not something we are waiting for six months or a year down the road.

*How would that relate to the tele-medicine project and AFHCAN?*

No sir, it cannot be related. The reason we can't put everything there is that it is illegal to do. This would be totally separate.

*What you are saying is that the equipment that is currently in our clinics is the equipment that is used right now to bounce the satellite, so what you are saying is that we basically get another one of those pieces of equipment that will receive and send information to one of your satellite in another building in the village and that building is the one that can be used for internet. How is the internet access being provided to other rural communities in the state now?*

If you are running over every circuit it can't be on this circuit that is being subsidized by the federal government. If the community just decides that we want to run internet access so we can have internet access to our community, we can do that.

You will actually need a separate bandwidth. You will need to be copasetic in your equipment. We could possibly provide the service to the communities inconjunction with CATG. In TelAlaska we only have certain communities that we service. It would depend on the community you are talking about. Our competitors have rerouted that, so if you are taking bout access I don't know. But if you are talking about the areas that we area serving basically we are in the community which that service is runned out of the community where we have our facilities.

The T1 circuits in the village is a local access a lot of times it comes down to that many times it is considered separate from that circuit. If this is running back to a POP, then gets aggravated in this traffic, so this is dedicated and that is dedicated only to you. If they become aggravated there is a fine line where we can assess the network

The reason that internet is not available or is not available in all the rural comities in Alaska is the number of people and the number of dollars. A single circuit for example, 56k is 1600 dollars a month that I would charge Alascom to roll that out. They have to have enough people willing to pay say 29.95 to equate the 1600. It would depend on the number of people in the community that will set the charge so that the price will break even.

When the circuits are busy that means that the next circuits has been over soaked, this basically means that you cannot get out for there are other people in front of you on the net. So you would have to wait till they are done using the system.

It was made mention that there will be training provided. You have the potential of losing local employment, because they will be by-passed because by using the satellite system you are no longer using the local phone system. It would be an added expense to fly someone in to work on the system locally if there are problems. Nobody will just take that cost and send someone out for free, you will be charged for that service. That shouldn't happen though if you are working with the local company.

*Our clinic is not hooked up, and you come in here today to present this proposal to make it work and so why does it not work in the villages. I have not heard of any training on the system either, though I know they have the equipment that was sent to them.*

To be honest with you I do not know why the system is not working in the villages, I was under the impression that they were all hooked up. I would be happy to check on that and get back with you on that.

There is no current video conferencing available in the villages, it is sole-internet circuit in place. This was what was originally designed and implemented. The CARTs I do not know where that came from, oh AFHCAN. To hook those up to the 128 internet circuit is going to give you the subsidies under the performance here, and it would not give you what you want, it would be very poor quality. It is not going to be something that you can look at and get a diagnosis from.

*My understanding is that those tele-medicine CARTS that were installed in the villages they are laid with the CATG networking, to the clinic here. Now sometime later on in the future there will be a leg from the clinic here to all over here to CAIHC and then to ANMC; but right now it is only local through the CATG network.*

*What people need to realize is that just because the equipment was there the whole project was not completed, so right now it is not doing much for health aide to send an image, versus we have to go to CAIHC to see the x-ray.*

That may be true, as we moved forward with the network we have tried to look at the extension but we have been hemmed a little bit by the contract with some of the existing network architecture. All of those things we can tie you back to ANMC and all the villages would hub back into Fort Yukon, with a single hop video between Venetie and Fort Yukon and then back to ANMC. This is part of expanding this network. This system has not existed four or five years ago.

This is what we are trying to get to you. The bandwidth is needed to hook the equipment up and then you can get there. Now that the need is there we can provide this service to you. For TelAlaska and ATT working in conjunction, that to date until the contract is signed it can be forty-five to sixty days. You call some of the other clinic that have been provided by our competitor you will hear it took up to six months to a year.

On the piece that he is talking about, that is correct in hooking up the T1 local access, on my side of it there will need to be some equipment upgrade, so there will be a time frame. To sit down with you and if we get to the point of signing a contract when you say we want this up by such and such a date and then we will work with you to bring that on line. We are willing to put it into writing. I am anticipating that a lot of the sights will need

work and equipment. Primarily in Alaska, with winter coming this is anticipated this will be through the summer to have this done and completed. Like I said what we can do is that by September 1, the network upgrade will be done.

*Currently like in Arctic, we have been having problems with our internet service, so will you guys be there to provide the technical services? It will be TelAlaska that we would get hold of. The other question is that would you be willing to make available and additional piece of one of those transponder for the Flats so that we can get internet to our homes.*

That is very funny that you should be bring that up. Without going to far into this, that was the plan what we are speaking here. We can talk with you about that off line, like them we can't talk about that now. Just because it is not to influence your decision on which contract you will take.

*You mentioned that we will be paying for the new facilities that our competitors are building in our communities, and from my understanding from their presentation that they were going to pay for that equipment and construction within our communities.*

We are still here, is that correct Art, that you all are going to pay for the new facilities built in each and everyone of the villages, the earth station and the (?) network.

Yes of course we are on the earth station construction.

*Do you have an overall price like you talked about a T1 rider wide area network, that included all that we have now, what would be the total cost to CATG?*

You will pay 900.45 per T1 times 8 would be your cost.

Does TelAlaska through ATT have any other tele-medicine projects around the state.  
Yes we do the Galena clinic.

We are currently running out of Ketichan, tele-psychology network with Juneau and Metlatkatla. When you get into tele-psychology you have to get to the point where you want to see that persons facial features, want to see any little thing.

*What kind of equipment are looking at for the video conferencing? What would happen to our wide area equipment and port if they are to be replaced?*

We are looking at poly-com and to be honest with you I don't know the model number, that would be out my area, but I can get you that information. No we are not providing that, the clinic down there applied for a grant that purchased their equipment. Everything for the wide area network will be replaced. To go into the camera to go into the equipment we would probably go with you with AFHCAN and with whatever they could not provide we can talk to USF for funding. TelAlaska has a grant writer who will be glad to work with you. We will start with that and work our way.

Besides the bandwidth that goes from 128k to T1, we would be going off a cell relay platform onto an actual dedicated T1 platform, that would zap modem straight up and down. It would be a different performing network. You will always have the .1ml sec per satellite delay that happens everywhere. What you would consider in that between the villages and Fort Yukon that would be a single hop.

Begin of tape 6 side a

That was non-existing technology and as the technology has changed and that is the reason why I here is to try to upgrade those facilities to incorporate those new technologies.

Floor open to questions:

I really need to respond here, and I don't know where to begin here. First of all I would like to formally request of CATG a copy the tape of this board meeting, it would be submitted to the Alaska Public Utilities Commission in response to two claims made.

1: that employment would be lost if you chose to go with GCI

Excuse me since we are having a debate here, I want to clear up this issue and the tape is there. The point is the statement made is that there will be potential job lost.

I would like to formally request a copy of this tape please, this man is not a hired consultant he is a hired gun, he came in here without a presentation, he came in here with a second presentation and all you have heard was responses to my presentation.

2: the second thing on this tape is that TelAlaska has never gotten a phone call from GCI to work with them. Him saying that on this tape that it would go to the Rural Utilities Commission and the facts will speak for itself how GCI have tried to work with them again-again tried to work with TelAlaska throughout the state and again-again have been refused to work with them.

In the Aleutian region that this man spoke of that we came in and wanted to bypass them. The true is we went to the Aleutian Bureau and said where the local utilities can provide the services we would rather have them provide the services, but where there not, where they can't we would provide those services. It forced them to respond to provide the internet services. Our offer to bypass them, the offer to service those communities were not there.

That was the probably the most mean spirited presentation that I have ever heard and I don't think you folks are like that. And he calls that a class act. Fear uncertainty and doubt, in the sales business that is called FUD. It is used by companies that have nothing to say positive. I came and did a presentation on what GCI will do for you, your organization and I backed it up with facts. I spoke no ill-will of anyone, but that is all heard for the last past hour. Its funny how Mr. Hatton has spent all his efforts here to say how wide and misrepresented ourselves, and how we showed up when the money showed up. The fact of the matter, the local phone companies make money from the moment they started providing services to your company because they are subsidized and guaranteed the rate of return on every dollar they spend. It is not out of the goodness of

their heart; it's a business and for him to imply that we are showing up when the money shows up is wrong. They provided you dedicated circuits here, and there is nothing wrong with the dedicated circuits, they are good. The technology we provide is better, we don't use as many resources as we dedicate circuits and we don't waste. This is a government funded program and we need to be concerned about waste; the government do not waste. The government is paying for 93-94% of this network and they are concerned about the prices they have to pay. He has you to believe that you cannot trust us, but that its him, he is the man without the trust. Trust is earned, we have had tele-medicine for four years since this program have started and we have earned those customers trust. I have taken the chairman of your board and village leaders, administrator and they have talked first-hand to our customer and have seen the trust that exist between us and our customers. That would be the trust that would prove to be and to prove to deliver good service here. It is unbelievable that a donation can be bad mouthed. I made a particular point of this being a public offer and for you to document because that is what the government requires. For no other reason but to cover you. He also said that we will bill you the full percent, we do not bill you full percent. It is hard for me to read my writing I was shaking so much listening to this. He talked about how one call is all you would need to respond to service on this network, then he used the conversation we had in response to a women's question on the dial modem call, and how she was frustrated on trying to figure out what was wrong, and he twisted that to imply that is what you would have to do with us. I just can not believe, never ever, that after selling tele-communications in this state listen to what I just listened too. Mr Hatten use to work for a company call CANAS (?) its true and its true he had the responsibility designing that network. But I can speak on the truth of canas, the fiber was not providing the level of service that Alyeska required and they were defaulting on their contract. There was a huge flop. Alyeska was walking away and the major bond holder behind the investment on that fiber is a company called MSS, who was later bought by World Com; and World Com as the bondholder called GCI to bail them out. GCI came in an cleaned up the problems of that fiber and now that fiber have been accepted by Alyeska and has proven to be and excellent facility. They are very happy with it. We don't use frame relay we use something called LAN, we told you that earlier. Confusion, that is what is happening here. Someone is raising others points to confuse you. He says its us and I am now saying is all you have to do is call the six health corporations that we have our networks with and you will not be confused by their answer and they wont be confused by the level of service they are getting from GCI. This is just not right I came in here with a positive message and all I get back is fear, uncertainty and doubt. The internet is not in your community today, why? It is under there control and it is not here. He says it will happen with this contract, but why is it not here now. GCI knows very well that the villages around Alaska, rural villages, have been dark as far as the internet goes, the digital divide that is right here in this state. We have turned to ATT Alascom about a year ago and said we have to fix this. The rural communities in Alaska need the same access as those people in Anchorage and Juneau have. And to ATT Alascom credit, they agreed, they agreed with the plan and we went forward. ATT Alascom does not call their own shots anymore they are owned by a bigger company, ATT. And when the president went to New Jersey he could not get the money needed to put internet into your villages. So our president went to our board and said we do not have a partner here. We are going to have to do it our selves and so our board said yes, so on June 6 of this year, a press

release was made stating that we are going to bring in 159 communities across Alaska without anyone's help. Wherever we have facilities we are bringing it in. I want to end up positive here, I want you to trust me but I don't want you to trust everything I say. I want you to talk with our customers, that is the fruit in the pudding there. And you wouldn't have seen that channel 2 newscast, and seen the things that is happening in Kotzebue region if it was not happening, we would not invent that, that was an un-bias third party. I am here to tell you that this can happen here too. Trust is a good thing, when it is earned. Thank you for your time.

*I was wondering are the cost less for that network that you are providing? So are you guys willing to match the cost that they are offering to us to run the system?*

I don't know the cost so I can't speak to that. The cost are dictated by the government not by us. I need to explain, the government sets the rate we are to pay based on the cost of the service in Anchorage, that is the program we all have to work under. No matter what our cost are, the government, you pay the same price because they are providing a dedicated private lines the cost to you are 900 a month. Because we are using a stronger and more advanced technology these private lines have been around since the telephone has been invented. They have not changed. The network we are providing the T1 service that you will get, unlike what this man said won't happen, is 796 because we are delivering it more efficiently and the government pays less, so since the government pays less, you will pay less. The T1 are a little more than a hundred dollars less a month to you. They talk about eight circuits, you need ten circuits. You need eight circuits to just get to the villages, you need a ninth for Fairbanks and tenth for ANMC. There are ten circuits. Well this 99,000 for each circuits that I have heard, you will need two more circuits.

That information is incorrect. We did not know about the Fairbanks circuits. Seven circuits to the villages and back to Fort Yukon and one to Anchorage is what we have provided to you.

So you are looking at apples and oranges.

One from Fort Yukon to Fairbanks at 12,000, so you are looking at 111 versus 121. talking about governmental monies putting it all together it is still quite a savings here.

Outside of Fort Yukon are there seven or eight villages?

There are nine. Let me do the math again. Fort Yukon to villages there are eight circuits. Fairbanks is nine. Anchorage is ten. Simple math.

I don't think it is the simple math, but the knowledge of their network.

I have the knowledge of what there network was and circuits. There has been some misrepresentation here, there sure has and a copy of that tape will prove it.

*For every organization there are pros and cons as to which one is chosen what would be the benefit of our choosing, what do you think?*

What do I think, right now I am pretty upset. I am not so much upset with ATT Alascom for they acted as we act, for they spoke up their network and their support. I can't think of the advantage of their network, there proposal we have so many other services loaded into our proposal. There are so much equipment that needs to be managed and monitored and you don't have the staff here to do that. The circuits usually stop in the little black box, and that black box and circuits is typically what a telephone company like ATT or GCI manages, monitors and maintains for you to provide that circuit; that is part of that circuit. So much of this proposal is beyond that black box. it is into your local area network, into servers, it is into routers and all of that is included into my proposal.

*Are there different packets, like it mentioned here with GCI, if we are going to spend money I would like to get the best packet for our tele-health.*

I certainly understand that, and that was also our concern. The reason why you don't have internet in your communities today is because the technology that is in your villages cannot deliver packets. They have to use these dedicated circuits, no packets. To officially provide services so that they are affordable to the consumers they need do things better. You need to share things you need to make sure the efficiencies in the network are made that will follow thru with the lower price of the consumers. GCI's commitment from the June 6, press release, is that GCI unlike TelAlaska will provide internet services to every community wherever we have facilities for the same price as Anchorage. Now do you buy a loaf of bread or gallon of gas as that they pay for in Anchorage, you cannot do that over private lines, it cost too much and that is why it is not here today. It's investments in your communities that you need, and that is why it is not here today. It is investments in your communities that you need and that is not happening today. Its that lack of investments that keeps these affordable services from your people. That is our commitment to you.

Can I get one final rebuttal in. Just like they said they are going to bring the services into your community for the same prices of Anchorage, question is their bids are being subsidized at extra cost from the government. He said that I am a hired gun, I am not a hired gun. I am an employee of TelAlaska and I only told you the truth. And what is better about sharing your bandwidth versus a private line. What is better about that. Mean spirited, but the truth of being mean spirited, let the truth be spoke. But if I stepped on the toes to tell the truth you wear the shoes you have to walk the walk. You can call Galena and ask them about their dealings with us and our competitors. In our presentation I always say our competitors, we have some that are outside of GCI and I am going to tell you the fact of the matter is that was an engineer at GCI, I was the engineer who provided that fiber and designed that network that he talked about. I am. That is me, and that is my network and I can tell you what that network can and can not do. What is it that you don't like about having a private line versus a shared. What is there not to like about it. Its technologies and the technologies should speak for itself. And even if we had to add too we can still met the needs of that customer. This is not a problem of me getting money from the government subsidize, this is what is it all about, the purpose in being in business is to make money, that is the bottom line and if you misrepresented itself don't talk domestic.

Is that why you are charging twice as much in Galena for the internet than Anchorage?  
Is that why internet service is not here in this community?

Well my thing is that internet service is so easy to provide in Alaska right now is NSIP(?), why is GCI not providing this service. In six months is the same time they are looking at providing the service that we are.

The other question that you might ask is that if GCI is providing internet and if they have been for three years they are in the community and I have not seen that rolled in the community in terms of internet to the folks.

Right now you apparently provide the internet for the schools that was supposedly roll out in to the community. Three years ago. Who here has internet access from GCI. You don't have to go to Kotzebue or Galena, go to your school. You paid for it why are you not getting it. That is what I am going to leave with you, if you are to have gotten three years ago through the school and you still don't have it, who you going to trust.

One other thing in a question that came up is the apple and oranges. If you will this is the oranges and apples, and in your packet is that the packet of information is what happens is that when you send data that gets chopped into little pieces and there are many circuits coming in from other locations all of their packets are in here. (using the flip chart) and as you go through this network that is where the congestions is at, for there are to many packets as what you are getting from the other side that will give you congestion is. We also have a frame relay network that we use.

What we run our frame relay system over is a private line on our atm network this is a specific packetized network. And so we run frame relay.

*The Kotzebue system that is the kind of packet that we would like to look at we can see everything from the village with the PA we have out here.*

Yes you can do that once you get your system in. Otherwise what I was saying about the frame relay network versus a private line network is again the cost. Why because you are combining and aggregating traffic through that network and as a result you are crossing over. It is also the fact that you are providing USF is providing 796 dollars for a packetized network versus the 945 dollars for the private line network. They recognize it as a difference in cost. Thank you chiefs.

There was just one point made that I need to clarify is that our proposal is not bypassing any local telephone company in your villages, we are using TelAlaska, Fort Yukon and all the other local telephone companies in the villages to provide the circuits from our earth station to the clinic with no bypass.

*This is the end of the presentation brought forth to the CATG board.*



*This is the portion that was copied and pasted from the actual minutes with spelling corrections.*

#### H. GCI vs. Tel-Alaska

**Cheryl Cadzow** – GCI talked about the future and Tel-Alaska talked about the pass, because they have a history here. What I basically heard was that Tel-Alaska has a History and they are part of the community. I know they have a history here, but they are not part of the community, because this is the first time I heard a representative from them speak. They have been here since the first phone was installed and this is the first time I have seen any one from there company's representative from their organization come in and speak to the community. Maybe they have but this is the first time I seen it or heard it. As someone who raises money for the Mighty Ducks Hockey team here and every year for the last six years I have written to them asking for donations and I never heard a response. That shouldn't be held against them because I have written to CATG here and haven't heard a response from them either. I sent a letter in November to CATG requesting a donation to the Hockey team and it is not on the agenda. It has been like this for six years. GCI, I am not familiar with them, I don't know if we will see them in our community. I know that the school is under GCI and our Internet and E-mail is working at the moment. Sometimes there are problems but most of the time its pretty steady.

**Paul Williams** – GCI seems to have more honesty in their presentation, they seem to know what to do with all the old equipment by replacing it with new technology. Tel-Alaska in their presentation keep referring to the opposition and that is a bad thing to do.

**Norberto Sanchez** – I have only one comment and that has to do with responsiveness, which is very important. When everything is installed and something goes wrong, how responsive are they going to be to fix it and to meet our needs. My experience with Alascom and AT&T hasn't been too good. Ever since May we have been trying to get a dedicated line that was connected to the Clinic to have our RPM assistant run directly to AMNC, it only took about six months to get it done. Most of the time Dale was running around trying to get a hold of Tel-Alaska to work with him to have that connection done. It took him several months just trying to locate that person.

**Charleen Fisher** – To be honest with you, I was suspicious with GCI in the beginning, with the surprise trip up to Kotzebue and without the rest of the Chiefs being informed or invited. It seems to me that they thought through things a little better. Tel-Alaska budget is just given individually per month and there is no overview on what the total cost is and they have one other service besides the dedicated line. They also charge \$125.00 for installation. I was wondering Pat if you did a break down of what the difference is in numbers total, from annual.

**Pat Stanley** – Yes I did. What I came up with from GCI, that if the villages support the idea bring in that rental for the cost to CATG is only \$507 per month instead of \$797, actually it cost us about \$20,000.00 more per year to get T-1's in our villages and clinics. We will also get all of our equipment changed out. To me that will be less cost to use, plus getting other advantages. Eventually we will get local access, though it is not

spoken. Right now our cost per year is \$42,000.00. What the cost per year looks like \$25,000 more with the \$507 and for Tel-Alaska it looks like the full cost is \$50 to \$60 thousand more without the other benefits. They were going to do some equipment changes. The only question I was having with the service other than the cost is this difference here, they are saying this pooled resources is not going to infringe on our getting what we need and when we need it.

**Don Stevens** – When you guys went up to Kotzebue, did you guys talk with customers.

**Larry Nathaniel** – Yes we talked with people in the clinic and they seem satisfied.

**Don Stevens** – Our communication between the villages and the clinic is not getting any smaller and the bills are not going to get any smaller either. I think since we have a lot of business with this communications; telephone, Internet and stuff that we need. I would like to see some technical experts, because I don't understand technical stuff like that.

**Charleen Fisher** – If the Chiefs choose GCI, GCI will have to build new stations and in Beaver the phone company already have two different lots with property on it and I would just like to make sure that was clearly defined and outlined because we sign off on it.

**Pat Stanley** – In the proposal they have a proposed lease agreement to look at. The other thing about the service is that GCI will be remotely censoring the Network all the time and would be on-call taking care of those things on immediate bases. AFHCAN has offered to take a look at the two proposals; they have the technical staff to do it. GCI want to order equipment, before summer construction. Tel-Alaska's timeline is not that critical, they are already in the house.

**Evon Peter** – I like for us to reach a decision on this. It makes sense know that we have the two proposals at hand and to send it too AFHCAN and see if AFHCAN can reply by the end of next week; and have a teleconference Friday. My thoughts, I think is relevant to the decision. With GCI we will have construction projects in the villages, which will provide some work during the summer time. Another thing their earth stations that are developed in each of the villages would actually be completed. They would be able to offer telephone service as well as Internet services through those earth stations. Because of their dedication and what they showed us in Kotzebue, wherever they put up an earth station they offer local Internet service at the same cost as they charge in Anchorage. Tel-Alaska, the only place they ever done that is in Galena and the cost is twice as much as it is in Anchorage. If were looking at Internet access to our local people in the villages by next summer GCI can provide that and Tel-Alaska cannot. Another thing they said they will be able to provide telephones, so there will be some competition there. Also the last point is the reason I am leaning towards GCI is that we have been with Tel-Alaska and AT&T for the last 5 years and I don't feel like we received the services and technical support and other things we currently need right now. It makes sense to go with GCI for 5 years, get new infrastructure in the Region. It will be sooner than you think, another 5 years would passed and then we will have another choice if we want to go back to the other guys or stay with them. Right now is a crucial time for us to build this new infrastructure in the villages.

**Fred Roberts** – Evon's has a good point, only one that is going to benefit is us from the competition.

**James Kelly** – Listening to everybody here, it is interesting. What you heard yesterday is a sales pitch. My question I have today is has the proper paper work have been submitted to start initiating process to request the funds your planning here. It is form 465; it is a form that you have to put in with Universal Service Rural Health Care. This is a process that nobody here is fully understanding. We checked on the Internet after we left yesterday and it is not on there. It is suppose to be posted and from that point once it is approved there is a certain amount of days that is allowed to start signing contracts. You have to be approved for those funds, is that right Pat.

**Pat Stanley** – What is happening is that you turn in a certain form each year, a 465 form, then it is approved and then goes 467 from the provider and then it has to be posted for 28 days and we do that every year. We have a contract with AT & T until next December and even that this is what GCI want us to do is say that we are going to go with them once that time frame is up and we will be on the Internet.

**James Kelly** – What I am saying as of yesterday it is not on there. That is why I am bringing it up, for clarification. This is where it is going to get confusing and you guys will get lost in the process. I got lost in it, because it is a new area for me. I could say this now, I am here as a CATG member, not an employee. Yukon Flats is a GCI customer and Cheryl mentioned that their Internet service is doing real good.

**Cheryl Cadzow** – I said that it is running.

**James Kelly** – O.K - AT & T and Tel-Alaska rented that cable care to GCI and GCI is basically just the maintenance that is tacked on there. Once it comes into school organization, then the school itself gets a contractor. That's basically how they work, everybody works that way. School has been a GCI customer for 4 or 5 years and someone mentioned that they are going to bring phone services in and this in. What's a good point they raised is that they been here for 4 years, how come they didn't come into Fort Yukon and compete with AT & T. I always ask that question. They are not offering long distance to reduce rates for people. They said yesterday that they are here for the community and they are going to keep prices low. That really caught me when they started saying that, because why aren't we seeing dish in every village. It raises a lot of questions, and there is no easy answer. You will have to put all this stuff together and absorb it, take the time and talk with T.C.C and ask them about their dealings with GCI. You need to ask other organizations who are dealing with GCI.

**Clarence Alexander** – I just wanted to let you know, I just been at the Yukon River Tribal River Water Shed Council, I have been put on National Board, it is called River Network. It has 15 members and I am the only Native person in the U.S. to be on that board. I thought I'd come by and let you know. Thanks for supporting me to be on that board. I see you have bison on your agenda, make sure your the owner, before you start making a deal.

**Motion made by:** Evon Peter that Pat Stanley put these proposals to AFHCAN and get their recommendation by the middle of next week.

Second by:  
Passed

Once we go into negotiations with GCI with the specifics of the contracts, that we don't sign a contract until the Chiefs approve the contract.  
Paul Williams

**Council Of Athabascan Tribal Governments**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**January 17-18-19, 2002 – Fort Yukon, Alaska**

**Minutes**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 9:30a.m. by Larry Nathaniel

**II. ROLL CALL/ ESTABLISH A QUORUM 02-17-02**

Arctic Village	Evon Peter	present
Beaver	Paul Williams	present
Birch Creek	Betty Itta (sit in)	present
Canyon Village	Stanley Jonas	present
Chalkyitsik	Paul Edwin	present
Circle	Larry Nathaniel	present
Fort Yukon	Cheryl Cadzow	present (9:40 AM)
Rampart		absent
Stevens Village	Don Stevens	present
Venetie	Bobby Tritt	present

Roll Call Established with 9 present and 1 absent.

For clarification, Betty Itta was asked to sit in for Winston James, until he arrived. Winston James arrived at 2:15 p.m.

**III. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

- N. Board Policies
- O. Policies and Procedures (check signers)
- P. Reorganization Proposal
- Q. International Indian Treaty Council Funding Request for travel to New Zealand
- R. Third Party billing
- S. T.C.C Convention (resolution for housing)
- T. Executive session

**Motion made by: Don Stevens to approve January 17-18 agenda with additions**

**Second by: Cheryl Cadzow**

**Passed**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 1. July 31 to August 3, 2001

**EXHIBIT 11**

## F. Evaluation Forms for Council Personnel Evaluations

No action was taken

## G. Payment for Education Summit Teleconferences

## H. GCI vs TelAlaska

**Cheryl Cadzow** – GCI talked about the future and TelAlaska talked about the past because they have a history here. What I basically heard was that TelAlaska has a History and they are part of the community. I know they have a history here, but they are not part of the community because this is the first time I heard a representative from them speak. They have been here since the first phone was installed and this is the first time I have seen any one from their company or a representative from their organization come in and speak to the community. Maybe they have but this is the first time I seen it or heard it. As someone who raises money for the Mighty Ducks Hockey team here and every year for the last 6 years I have written to them asking for Donations and I never heard a response. That shouldn't be held against them because I have written to CATG here and haven't heard a response from them either. I sent a letter in November to CATG requesting a donation to the Hockey team and it is not on the agenda. It has been like this for six years. GCI, I am not familiar with them, I don't know if we will see them in our community. I know that the school is under GCI and our Internet and E-mail is working at the moment. Sometimes there are problems but most of the time its pretty steady.

**Paul Williams** – GCI seems to have more honesty in their presentation, they seem to know what to do with all the old equipment by replacing it with new Technology. TelAlaska, in their presentation, kept referring to the opposition and that is a bad thing to do.

**Norberto Sanchez** – I have only one comment and that has to do with responsiveness, which is very important. When everything is installed and something goes wrong, how responsive are they going to be to fix it and to meet our needs. My experience with Alascom and AT&T hasn't been too good. Ever since May we have been trying to get a dedicated line that was connected to the Clinic to have our RPMS system run directly to ANMC - it only took about six months to get it done. Most of the time Dale was running around trying to get a hold of TelAlaska to work with him to have that connection done. It took him several months just trying to locate that person.

**Charleen Fisher** – To be honest with you, I was suspicious with GCI in the beginning, with the surprise trip up to Kotzebue and without the rest of the Chiefs being informed or invited. It seems to me that they thought through things a little better. TelAlaska budget is just given individually per month and there is no over view on what the total cost is and they have one other service besides the dedicated line. They also charge \$125.00 for installation. I was wondering Pat if you did a break down of what the difference is in numbers total, from annual.

**Pat Stanley** – Yes I did. What I came up with from GCI that, if the Villages support the idea of bringing that village site rental to CATG, is only \$507 per month instead of \$797, actually it cost us about \$20,000.00 more per year to get T-1's in our villages and

clinic's. We will also get all of our equipment changed out. To me that will be less cost to us, plus getting other advantages. Eventually we will get local access, though it is not stated. Right now our cost per year is \$42,000.00. What the cost per year looks like \$25,000 more with the 507 and for TelAlaska it looks like the full cost is 50 to 60 thousand more with out the other benefits. They were going to do some equipment changes. The only question other than the cost is if this pooled resource is not going to infringe on our getting what we need and when we need it.

**Don Stevens** – When you guys went up to Kotzebue, did you guys talk with customers.

**Larry Nathaniel** – Yes we talked with people in the clinic and they seem satisfied.

**Don Stevens** – Our communication between the villages and the clinic is not getting any small and the bills are not going to get any smaller either. I think since we have a lot of business with this communications; Telephone, Internet and stuff that we need. I would like to see some Technical experts, because I don't understand technical stuff like that.

**Charleen Fisher** – If the Chiefs choose GCI, GCI will have to build new stations and in Beaver the phone company already has two different lots with property on it and I would just like to make sure that was clearly defined and outlined before we sign off on it.

**Pat Stanley** – In the proposal they have a proposed lease agreement to look at. The other thing about the service is that GCI will be remotely sensing the Network all the time and would be on call taking care of those things on an immediate bases. AFHCAN has offered to take a look at the two proposals. They have the Technical staff to do it. GCI wants to order equipment before summer construction. TelAlaska's time line is not that critical, they are already in house

**Evon Peter** – I'd like us to reach a decision on this. It makes sense now that we have the two proposals at hand to send it to AHFCAN and see if AHFCAN can reply by the end of next week and have a teleconference Friday. With GCI, we will have construction projects in the villages, which will provide some work during the summer time. Another thing - their earth stations that are developed in each of the villages would actually be competition. They would be able to offer Telephone service as well as Internet services through those earth stations. Because of their dedication and what they showed us in Kotzebue, wherever they put up an earth station they offer local Internet service at the same cost as they charge in Anchorage. TelAlaska - the only place they did that is in Galena and the cost is twice as much as it is in Anchorage. If we are looking at Internet access to our local people in the villages by next summer, GCI can provide that and TelAlaska cannot. Another thing they said - they will be able to provide Telephones, so there will be some competition there. Also the last point is the reason I am leaning towards GCI is that we have been with TelAlaska and AT&T for the last 5 years and I don't feel like we received the services and technical support and other things we currently need right now. It makes sense to go with GCI for 5 and get new infrastructure in the region. It will be sooner than you think - another 5 years would pass and then we will have another choice if we want to go back to the other guys or stay with them. Right now is a crucial time for us to build this new infrastructure in the villages.

**Fred Roberts** – Evon has a good point. The only one that is going to benefit is us from the competition.

**James Kelly** – Listening to everybody here, it is interesting. What you heard yesterday is a sales pitch. My question I have today is has the proper paper work been submitted

to start initiating the process to request the funds for your planning here. It is form 465. It is a form that you have to put into the Universal Service Rural Health Care. This is a process that nobody here that is fully understanding. We checked on the Internet after we left yesterday and it is not on there. It is suppose to be posted and from that point once it is approved there is a certain amount of days that is allowed to start signing contracts. You have to be approved for those funds, is that right Pat.

**Pat Stanley** – You turn in a 465 form and it is approved (as an eligible service and posted on the internet for 28 days). Then the service provider submits a 468 form to CATG and CATG sends it to the Universal Service fund. CATG then receives a commitment to pay from the Universal Service fund and turns in a 467 form saying that CATG is receiving the service. That releases the funds to the service provider. GCI wants us to say that we are going to go with them once that time frame is up (with the AT&T contract).

**James Kelly** – What I am saying is that, as of yesterday, it is not on there. That is why I am bringing it up, for clarification. This is where it is going to get confusing and you guys will get lost in the process. I got lost in it, because it is a new area for me. I could say this now, I am here as a CATG member, not an employee. Yukon Flats is a GCI customer and Cheryl mentioned that their Internet service is doing real good.

**Cheryl Cadzow** – I said that it is running.

**James Kelly** – O.K - AT&T and TelAlaska rented that cable to GCI and GCI is basically just the maintenance that is tacked on there. Once it comes into school organization, then the school itself gets a contractor. That is basically how they work, everybody works that way. School has been a GCI customer for 4 or 5 years and someone mentioned that they are going to bring phone services in and this in. What is a good point they raised here is that they been here for 4 years, how come they didn't come into Fort Yukon and compete with AT&T. I always ask that question. They are not offering long distance to reduce rates for people. They said yesterday that they are here for the community and they are going to keep prices low. That really caught me when they started saying that, because why aren't we seeing a dish in every village. It raises a lot of questions, no easy answer. You will have to put all this stuff together and absorb it, take the time and talk with TCC and ask them about their dealings with GCI. You need to ask other organizations that are dealing with GCI.

**Clarence Alexander** – I just wanted to let you know that I've just been to the Yukon River Inter-Tribal Watershed Council and I have been put on the national board for the River Network. It has 15 members and I am the only Native person in the U.S. to be on that board. I thought I'd come by and let you know. Thanks for supporting me to be on that board.

I see you have Bison on your agenda; make sure you're the owner before you start making a deal.

**Motion made by:** Evon Peter that Pat Stanley put these proposals to AFHCAN and get their recommendation by the middle of next week. Once we go into negotiations with GCI with the specifics of the contracts, that we don't sign a contract until the Chiefs approve the contract.

**Second by:** Paul Williams



AUG-12-2003 TUE 04:15 PM CATG

FAX NO. 907 662 3333

P. 23

1-29-02

**COUNCIL OF ATHABASCAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS**  
**January 29, 2002 @ 3:30 p.m.**  
**Teleconference**  
**Minutes**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order by Larry Nathaniel @ 3:30 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL/ESTABLISH A QUORUM**

Arctic Village	Joel Tritt	Present (3:50p.m.)
Beaver	Charleen Fisher	Present
Birch Creek	Winston James	Present (4:15p.m.)
Canyon Village	Stanley Jonas	Present
Chalkyitsik	James Nathaniel Jr.	Present
Circle	Larry Nathaniel	Present
Fort Yukon	Cheryl Cadzow	Present
Rampart		Absent
Stevens Village	Don Stevens	Absent
Venetie	Bobby Tritt	Present

**III. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Additions under business

- d. Medicaid and medical
- e. Two Health Aides in Chalkyitsik

**Motion made by Bobby Tritt to approve the January 29<sup>th</sup> agenda w additions  
2<sup>nd</sup> by Stanley Jonas  
Motion passes**

**IV. COUNCIL AND PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
No comments

**V. BUSINESS**

- a. GCI vs. Tel Alaska

AUG-12-2003 TUE 04:16 PM CATG

FAX NO. 907 862 3333

P. 24

**Pat Stanley** - I contacted AHFCAN and gold streaked the proposals. Tom Bohn and Tom Bunker have reviewed them. They would like to walk through the proposals to tell you their thoughts and concerns. If we do decide to contract with GCI or TelAlaska, they are more than willing to be involved in the contract negotiations.

**Tom Bunker** - I've been working with the Alaska Federal Health Care Access Network since July. Prior to that, I was up in Nome doing wide area Network Management for Nome and their surrounding Villages. We have been looking at the proposal G.C.I and TelAlaska submitted for the C.A.T.G Network. There are a couple of comments that we would like to make on these. One, G.C.I is selling a "Bandwidth on Demand" service and that is not necessarily a bad thing. But, as a customer, you would want to ask the service provider for a guarantee that there would be enough Bandwidth when you demand it. Your network will be using services like video conferencing, transmitting medical images, and other applications. If you don't have the circuits and the telecommunications services that handle those requests, you are not going to be able to get the most out of the services you are paying for. When you are talking about "Bandwidth on Demand" as opposed to "Dedicated Bandwidth", that would be one caution. Ask the provider if they could provide you some written guarantee that you will receive the Bandwidth that you are paying for and that you will be able to run certain types of applications through out the Network. I don't see any hard and fast guarantee from G.C.I that the Bandwidth will be available and that they will guarantee to remedy the situation if the Bandwidth is not available.

**Tom Bohn** - I've been with AFHCAN Telemedicine project for several years. I want to conceptually describe what we are talking about in a way that might be helpful. The kind of circuit that G.C.I has put in their proposal is a "Shared Backbone" packet with services. What I want to drive home for you is the importance of making sure that you have a written guarantee of recommended Bandwidth capacity and line rate on that Network. The telecommunications circuits that you are going to buy are kind of like an automobile - that automobile can go at a certain maximum rate - say the highest speed is 60 miles per hour. When you have a clear highway, you can run that car at 60 miles per hour. If your car is capable of going 60 miles per hour, but your highway is full of other cars that are capable of going 60 miles per hour, you would not be able to go the maximum speed due to congestion on that highway. We feel that it is really important for C.A.T.G to have a written guarantee - that G.C.I is going to say, "we're going to manage that network in order for you to drive your car at least 30 miles per hour, but it's going to be capable of going 60 miles per hour most of the time". If you are going to buy T 1 or 512 K or 766 K capacity circuits on the Network, you will

AUG-12-2003 TUE 04:18 PM CATG

FAX NO. 907 882 3333

P. 25

need to make sure that you have a written guarantee from them that says you will always have a certain number per second and guaranteed Bandwidth capacity across that Network. What we are describing are the two elements of the packets of circuits, there is support B, that's the 1.5-mega bits per second that G.C.I is talking about in their proposal. We don't see a guarantee in the proposal of minimum limited information rate for your Network to guarantee that you will always have at have least 68 K or half of that capacity always across that circuit.

As far as the rest of the proposal goes, Tom and I both agree that it is a great proposal. You are getting a lot of valuable offers from G.C.I. Given the two options, you're getting a richer set of features from the G.C.I proposal. What we would like to do is try to caution you. We don't believe that we would recommend that you sign the proposal, as written, today. But, with a little more give and take from the telecommunications company on written guarantees, that it is a promising proposal.

Tom Bunger - I would add to that, that the move to replace your equipment with Cisco gear is free of charge and is a huge bonus to C.A.T.G that will benefit your organization in the long run. Using standardized equipment will definitely make it a lot easier to fund all sorts of different projects. We wanted to focus in on that area because that is the main difference between the two proposals. We are here to answer any questions or clarify any of the things we mentioned.

Larry Nathaniel - You've given your perspective on G.C.I, what does TelAlaska have to offer?

Tom Bohn - It's really hard to do an apple-to-apple comparison. The two proposals are of a different nature. AT&T's Satellite Network is a reliable and supporting Network, but the proposal doesn't include the same future rich set of technical support on the ground level within your region that we see represented in the other proposal. We believe that it will be a positive thing for C.A.T.G to get technical support with networking devices wired into this contract. The way it is presented in the G.C.I proposal, the Company is purchasing part of the cost of the bandwidth. In the AT&T proposal, technology support is quoted at an hourly rate - over and above the cost of bandwidth. That is a significant difference that you can't overlook. The technical support required to make the Network function would be over and above the cost of basic bandwidth. Given the integrative support options G.C.I has chosen to offer, it's difficult to make a recommendation that you go in the other direction.

AUG-12-2003 TUE 04:17 PM CATG

FAX NO. 907 662 3333

P. 26

**Pat Stanley** - I understand that you were recently in Kotzebue - we did check out their system, but it was not enough. It looked great with what they were doing for telemedicine. I want to know what your opinion was on how the system was working interactivity with the villages around the Kotzebue area.

**Tom Bohn** - I was in Kotzebue throughout the week. The system in Kotzebue is working well with all their village clinics and we were capable of doing multi-video conferencing, voice services over those satellite circuits and pulling forward on telemedicine from the AFHCAN project with some degree of success. The only difference from what was proposed for C.A.T.G and what they have working in Kotzebue is that the circuits running between Kotzebue and Anchorage are not shared. That is the only difference between these two. The Kotzebue packet is on the packet backbone.

**Pat Stanley** - G.C.I said that their policy is that, when 80% of the bandwidth is being used over a three-day period, they will provide additional transponder space.

**Tom Bohn** - What they are talking about is the packet Network as a whole. When all subscribers on that packet Network push the backbone to an 80% capacity usage level, they will go to the Satellite transponder market and look for additional Bandwidth for that packet backbone.

What we are more interested in advocating for you is that C.A.T.G - as an entity contracting for services from G.C.I - has a service level agreement that is specific to C.A.T.G. Also, that you ask the telecommunications company to provide you with a written guarantee that they will always have a committed amount of bandwidth available across your individual telecommunication circuits at all times and that it be part of the deal. You'll note that in all their descriptions of the packet T-1 service they refer to a packet T-1, but they make no reference to a guaranteed committed information rate, which is what we are seeking from them in the proposal to you.

They should also provide you with a remedy should that Bandwidth not be available to you. You should have - lined out in writing - what they will do to remedy that situation. It may be good for them to say "yes we will seek additional transponder backbone capacity if we know there is an 80% utilization rate across the entire packet backbone." But, if you find that over a period of one day there is a Bandwidth shortage and you can't get what you need out of that Network for that business day, what do they offer to remedy that? Do they pro-rate your charges for that month? How do they monitor that and how do they provide you with a utilization report that meets your monitoring and over site needs?

Norberto Sanchez - That is not what I wrote in the letter. What I discussed was the use of the medicaid money to pay for Indirect Cost of the over expenses. That money, the board agreed should be spent on health purposes.

Pat Stanley - I would like to recommend putting this on our face-to-face meeting, so that all the Chiefs can discuss this and have a little more information.

e. Two Health Aides in Chalkyitsik

Chalkyitsik submitted a letter of request to Norberto for two Health Aides.

VI. COUNCIL AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Venetie would like to let all the Chiefs know that we are having a meeting 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>, everybody is invited to come up and visit us

Tamara Joseph will supply everybody in the villages with their election results.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATES

March 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, 2002 at Fort Yukon

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Stanley Jonas to adjourn at 4:28 PM

2<sup>nd</sup>; Bobby Tritt

Motion passes

*audio tape  
retranscribed*

What we have here are the Tom's discussing the GCI-TelAlaska contract via teleconference: typed 9/18/03 inserted were some of the discussion items that were not included in the first draft..

V. BUSINESS

a. GCI vs. Tel Alaska

**Pat Stanley** - I contacted AHFCAN and gold streaked the proposals. Tom Bohn and Tom Bunger have reviewed them. They would like to walk through the proposals to tell you their thoughts and concerns. If we do decide to contract with GCI or TelAlaska, they are more than willing to be involved in the contract negotiations. They would like to offer themselves as a resource, and would assist us with any contracts we do with them.

**Tom Bunger** - I've been working with the Alaska Federal Health Care Access Network since July. Prior to that, I was up in Nome doing wide area Network Management for Kwerak Inc in Nome and their surrounding Villages. We have been looking at the proposal that G.C.I and TelAlaska submitted for the C.A.T.G Network. There are a couple of comments that we would like to make on these. A couple of things that we would like to highlight and have you think about. One: G.C.I is selling a "Bandwidth on Demand" service and that is not necessarily a bad thing or an obscure thing its fairly common in the telecommunications. But, as a customer, you would want to ask the service provider for a guarantee that there would be enough Bandwidth there when you demand it. Your network will be using services like video conferencing, or transmitting medical images, and other associated applications. If you don't have the circuits and the telecommunications services that can handle those requests, then you are not going to be able to get the most out of the services you are paying for. So when you are talking about "Bandwidth on Demand" as opposed to "Dedicated Bandwidth", that would be one caution to ask the provider if they could provide you some written guarantee that you will receive the Bandwidth that you are paying for and that you will be able to run certain types of high bandwidth applications throughout the Network. As I looked through the proposal I do not see any hard and fast guarantee from G.C.I that the Bandwidth would be available and that they would guarantee to remedy to the situation if the Bandwidth was not available at certain times.

**Tom Bohn** - I've been with AFHCAN Telemedicine project for several years. I want to conceptually describe what we are talking about in a way that might be helpful. The kind of circuit that G.C.I has put in their proposal are a "Shared Backbone" packet switch services. What I want to drive home for you is the importance of making sure that you have a written guarantee of committed

Bandwidth capacity and line rate on that Network. A good way to throw an analogy out there for how you would think about the telecommunications circuits that you are going to buy are kind of like an automobile - that automobile can go at a certain maximum rate - say the highest speed is 60 miles per hour; and if you have a clear highway, you can run that car at 60 miles per hour. If your car is capable of going 60 miles per hour, but your highway is full of other cars that are capable of going 60 miles per hour, you would not be able to go the maximum speed due to congestion on that highway. We are trying to caution you about and in advising you on in a fashionable way of buyer beware about the GCI proposal, is that we feel that it is really important for C.A.T.G to have a written guarantee - that G.C.I is going to say, " we are going to manage that network in order for you to drive your car at least 30 miles per hour, but it's going to be capable of going 60 miles per hour most of the time, but you will always go at least 30 mph.

If you are going to buy T 1 or 512 K or 768 K capacity circuits on their Network, you will need to make sure that you have a written guarantee from them that says you will always have a certain number per second and guaranteed Bandwidth capacity across that Network. What we have been describing are the two elements of the packet switch kind of circuits you have, there is Port B, that's the 1.5-mega bits per second that G.C.I is talking about in their proposal that they say their circuit is capable of running at. What we don't see is a guarantee anywhere in the proposal of minimum admitted information rate for your Network that guarantees you will always have at least 768 K or half of that capacity always across each one of those circuits.

As far as the rest of the proposal goes, Tom and I both agree that it is a great proposal. You are getting a lot of important valuable offers from G.C.I. We are focusing on the committed information rate concept because we believe that given the two options, you're looking at a richer set of features from the G.C.I proposal. What we would like to do is try to caution you is that we don't believe that we would recommend that you sign the proposal, as written, today. But, with a little more give and take from the telecommunications company on written guarantees, that it is a promising proposal.

**Tom Burger** - I would add to that, that the move to replace your equipment with Cisco gear free of charge is a huge bonus to C.A.T.G that will benefit your organization in the long run. Using standardized equipment will definitely make it a lot easier to find self-service help and inoperative ability with all sorts of projects; it is a more standard platform. That along with some educational incentives and there is a lot of good things that comes with the

proposal. We wanted to focus in on that area because that is the main difference between the two proposals, and the rest of the stuff is all good but we wanted to focus on this as the main topic. We are here to answer any questions or to clarify any of the things we mentioned.

**Larry Nathaniel** - You've given your perspective on G.C.I, what does TelAlaska have to offer?

**Tom Bohn** - We spent some time on the TelAlaska proposal which includes AT&T, Alascom wide-area network circuits. It's really hard to do an apple-to-apple comparison here because there are two proposals are of a different nature. The comments I would throw out regarding AT&T/ TelAlaska' proposal is the ATT Satellite Network is an extremely reliable and health supported Network, but the proposal doesn't include the same feature rich set of technical support at the ground level within your region that we see represented in the other proposal. So our reaction is based more so on the fact that we believe that it will be a positive thing for C.A.T.G to get technical support with networking devices wired into this contract, the way we see it presented in the G.C.I proposal, as part of the cost of the bandwidth that is being purchased from the company. In the AT&T proposal, technology support is quoted at an hourly rate - over and above the cost of bandwidth and connectivity. That is a significant difference that you can't overlook, because it would mean that the technical support required to make the Network function would be a cost over and above basic bandwidth cost. Given the integrative support options G.C.I has chosen to offer, it's difficult to make a recommendation that you go in the other direction.

**Pat Stanley** - I understand that you were recently in Kotzebue - we did check out their system, but we were not able to see enough. It looked great with what they were doing for telemedicine. I wanted to know what your opinion was on how the system was working interactivity with the villages around the Kotzebue area.

**Tom Bohn** - I was in Kotzebue throughout the week. The system in Kotzebue is working well. The type of transport being offered by GCI to CATG is being used with the Manilaq network in Kotzebue. There is one substantive difference being proposed to CATG versus the system Manilaq operates. Right now it is working fairly well with all of their village clinics and we have been doing the multipoint video conferencing, voice services over those satellite circuits and data services over those satellite circuits and pulling forward telemedicine stuff from the AFHCAN project with some degree of success, but the only difference from what was proposed for C.A.T.G and what they have working on in Kotzebue is that the nature of the circuits



running between Kotzebue and Anchorage are not shared. That is the only deference between these two, that the circuit from Kotzebue and Anchorage is a lease line private line circuit and is not on the shared packet backbone. The Kotzebue circuits are on the packet backbone. It may be that Manilaq makes the decision to roll that Anchorage circuit in the packet network as well. I know GCI has been advocating that Manilaq make that decision. I'd like to focus on the two systems, the Kotzebue circuit with Anchorage is dedicated so that all of the bandwidths are available all of the time; whereas the circuits between the villages and Kotzebue are on the shared packet backbone and are more like what we have talked about before on the shared circuit rate.

**Pat Stanley** - G.C.I said that their policy is that, when 80% of their bandwidth is being used over a three-day period, they will provide additional transponder space.

**Tom Bohn** - Right, and what they are talking about is the packet Network as a whole. When all subscribers on that packet Network and when all subscribers pushes the entire network backbone to an 80% capacity usage level, then they will go to the Satellite transponder market and look for additional Bandwidth to add to that packet backbone. That is a slightly different thing than what we are advocating for you to do to look out for your interest before you sign a contract with them for this service. This may be well and good for them to do as a telecommunication company to have that kind of management philosophy about their satellite packet service but what are more interested in advocating for you is that C.A.T.G - as an entity that is contracting for services from G.C.I - have a service level agreement that is specific to C.A.T.G. Also, that you ask the telecommunications company to provide you with a written guarantee that they will always have a committed amount of bandwidth available across your individual telecommunication circuits at all times to you and that it be part of the deal. You'll note that in all their descriptions of the packet T-1 service they refer to a packet T-1, but they make no reference to a guaranteed committed information rate, which is what we are seeking from them in their proposal to you is that they be able to provide a written guarantee that the bandwidth be available to you across these particular circuits and they should also be able to provide you with a remedy should that bandwidth not be available as they say it will be in the written guarantee, that CATG should have in writing what they will do to remedy that situation for you, while it may be good for them to say that yes we will seek additional transponder backbone capacity should if we note an 80% utilization rate across the entire packet backbone but in the event there is a usage spike and you find that over a period of one day there is a bandwidth shortage you can't get what you need out of that network for that business day, what do they do, what do they offer to remedy that. Do they prorate the charges for that month and you pay less because the bandwidth was not there and how do they monitor that and how do they provide you with a utilization report that meets your monitoring and oversight needs of the contract.

They should also provide you with a remedy should that Bandwidth not be available to you. You should have - lined out in writing - what they will do to remedy that situation. It may be good for them to say "yes we will seek additional transponder backbone capacity if we know there is an 80% utilization rate across the entire packet backbone." But, if you find that over a period of one day there is a Bandwidth shortage and you can't get what you need out of that Network for that business day, what do they offer to remedy that? Do they pro-rate your charges for that month? How do they monitor that and how do they provide you with a utilization report that meets your monitoring and over site needs?

**Pat Stanley** - A utilization report would be beneficial to us but I don't know how they would provide that.

**Tom Bohn** - They should be able to answer that question for you in writing as part of the contract. That would be something I would advocate you to require from the company before you go into any kind of a deal. They should be able to provide you with a description of the means and methodology they would be using to track utilization on their Network and they should be committed to provide you with a monthly report or a bi annual report or some interactive monitor tool that is web based that gives you the opportunity to actively monitor what is happening.

**Charleen Fisher** - AFHCAN has given us their recommendation on the G.C.I vs. TelAlaska proposal. Now the administrative staff should go back and review these recommendations and to see if the companies are willing to have in writing their compliance and guarantees that will provide telemedicine technology into our region and bring back to the Council those agreements before the board takes any action.

**Motion:** Charleen Fisher moved to have the administrative staff go back to G.C.I to see if they are willing to comply with the request guarantees and if so to have it in writing and then get back to the Council with the results.

**2nd:** Bobby Tritt

#### **Roll call vote**

Arctic Village	Joel Tritt	Yes
Beaver	Charleen Fisher	Yes
Birch Creek	Winston James	Absent
Canyon Village	Stanley Jonas	Off Line
Chalkyitsik	James Nathaniel Jr.	Yes